## NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.111.5.

## IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION SIX

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ALAN RUSSELL NEUMAN,

Defendant and Appellant.

2d Crim. No. B296747 (Super. Ct. No. 2014032494) (Ventura County)

Alan Russell Neuman appeals a February 22, 2019 order revoking and terminating probation. The trial court sentenced appellant to three years state prison based on a 2016 conviction for failure to register as a sex offender after moving, with a prior serious violent felony (Pen. Code, §§ 290.013, subd. (a), 1170, subd. (h)(3)), and ordered appellant to pay various fines and fees.

We appointed counsel to represent appellant in this appeal. After counsel's examination of the record, he filed an opening brief in which no issues were raised.

On June 25, 2019, we advised appellant that he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. On July 22, 2019, appellant submitted a supplemental letter brief stating, among other things, that he was not mentally competent when he entered the

change of plea in 2016. The record reflects that the change of plea was knowingly, voluntarily and intelligently entered. In 2018, appellant violated probation multiple times by not reporting to his probation officer, not submitting to drug and alcohol testing, not registering within five days of his release from custody, not participating in sex offender therapy, changing residence without the approval of his probation officer, failing to make himself available for a search, providing a false name to an officer, and refusing to a search of his belongings. Before the probation violation hearing, the trial court denied appellant's petition for habeas corpus, and during the hearing, the trial court denied appellant's *Marsden* motion (*People v. Marsden* (1970) 2 Cal.3d 118) for appointment of new counsel.

We have reviewed the entire record and are satisfied that appellant's attorney has fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 443; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 126.)

The judgment is affirmed. NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

YEGAN, J.

We concur:

GILBERT, P. J.

PERREN, J.

## F. Dino Inumerable, Judge

\_\_\_\_\_

Richard B. Lennon, Executive Director for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Respondent.